

#4

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of	:	Group Art Unit 2111
Nepela	:	Examiner R. Patel
Serial No. 08/702,977	:	
Filed 08/26/96	:	
	:	April 10, 2000
	:	Attorney Docket A26996

METHODS AND COMPOSITIONS FOR OPTIMIZING PROPERTIES OF
MAGNETORESISTIVE SENSORS

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SUPPLEMENT TO PETITION UNDER RULE 1.53 (e)

Sir:

Parent patent application serial number 08/702,977 was filed on August 26, 1996 with 104 claims. The claims were classified into two species by the Examiner. A Notice of Allowance dated November 12, 1997 was received for Claims 1-6, 9, 11, 19, 21-23, 25-33, 37, 40-41, 46, 49, 51-52, 77-78 and 80-81 of Species I. Prior to payment of the issue fee which was submitted on February 5, 1998, an application that was intended to be a divisional application and which included the claims of Species 2 was filed. However Applicant used a CPA transmittal form that was modified to reflect the filing of a divisional application. There was no notice received from the Examiner that the intended divisional application was to be accepted as a continued prosecution application (CPA).


Claims 53, 55, 58, 59, 61, 65, 67, 69-71, 83-85, 93-95 and 99-104 of Species II of the intended divisional application were allowed on May 28, 1998 and the issue fee was paid. Prior to payment of the issue fee on August 10, 1998, a second intended divisional application including claims 7, 10, 12, 14, 15, 20, 24, 38, 39, 47, 48, 50, 56, 63, 64, 66, 79, 82 and 96-98 was filed on August 3, 1998. Again, in this instance, there was no notice received from the Examiner that the intended divisional application was to be accepted as a CPA application. Also there has been no Office Action relating to the application that was filed on August 3, 1998.

A Petition Under 37 CFR 1.53(e) was submitted on December 16, 1998 and a second petition was submitted on March 5, 1999 for this case. This Supplemental

Petition is being submitted to make of record that there were no notices received from the Examiner that would indicate to Applicant that the intended divisional applications were to be processed as CPA cases and that the allowed parent application for which an issue fee was paid would be abandoned.

Applicant was not advised by the Examiner or the United States Patent and Trademark Office that the intended divisional applications were accepted and were to be treated as CPA applications. Therefore there was no opportunity for Applicant to rectify the problem caused by the use of the modified CPA form. Applicant believes that an acknowledgement by the USPTO should have been made that the intended divisional applications were accepted only as CPA cases. The failure to inform Applicant adversely affected the right of Applicant to proceed with proper processing of the intended divisional applications. Consideration of this Supplement to the Petition submitted on March 5, 1999 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Nathan N. Kallman". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned to the right of the typed name.

NNK:el

Nathan N. Kallman